

REMARKS

Claim 5-9 are presented for consideration, with Claim 8 being independent.

Claim 8 is now presented in independent form to better set forth Applicants' claimed invention.

The Office Action indicates, for a second time, that Applicants have not filed a certified copy of the foreign priority documents as required by 35 U.S.C. § 119(b). Applicants respectfully wish to point out, however, that such priority documents were attached to the Submission of Priority Documents filed July 7, 2004. A copy of the postcard receipt date-stamped by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 7, 2004, and acknowledging receipt of three priority applications, was attached to the previous Amendment of May 1, 2007. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the priority documents were received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and thus acknowledgment of Applicants' perfected claim to priority is respectfully requested.

The amendments to the claims were not presented earlier as it was believed that the previously presented claims would be found allowable. This Amendment reduces the total number of claims. Moreover, the Examiner's familiarity with the subject matter of the present application will allow an appreciation of the significance of the amendments herein without undue expenditure of time and effort. Finally, the Amendment does not raise new issues requiring further consideration or search. Accordingly, it is submitted that consideration and entry of the Amendment is appropriate.

Claims 1-4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Wörn '102. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over Wörn in view of Shimabukuro '079, and Claim 6 was rejected as allegedly being obvious over those citations and further in view of Morgenthaler '609. Still further, Claim 7 was rejected as allegedly being obvious over Wörn in view of Choi '264, and Claim 9 was rejected as allegedly being obvious over Wörn in view of Knox '750. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 of Applicants' invention relates to a display apparatus comprised of an image display section, a housing for supporting the image display section, and a plurality of switch groups arranged in the housing. Each switch group has a plurality of switches which have different functions from one another, with one of the plurality of switch groups arranged on a left side and another of the switch groups arranged on the right side with respect to the image display section. The plurality of switches arranged on the left side have the same function as the plurality of the switches arranged on the right side. As also claimed, a distance between the switch group arranged on the left side and the switch group arranged on the right side is a distance wherein a user who is on one side of the right and left sides can not touch the switches arranged on the side opposite to the one side without obstructing the image display section.

In accordance with Applicants' claimed invention, a display apparatus with improved functionality can be provided.

As discussed in Applicants' previous Amendment, the primary citation to Wörn relates to a programming device that includes a housing 2 having a display. The plurality of switches and/or functions keys 4 are located on either side and above the display.

In addressing the rejection of Claim 8, the Office Action asserts that in order for a user standing on the right side of the device and wanting to reach the switches on the left side of the device, he/she needs to obstruct the image display. This assertion is respectfully traversed. The programming device in Wörn is a hand-held device, that is preferably held with the hands at lateral grip areas 7 and 8 (see column 3, lines 44-45 and column 4, lines 25 and 26). As such, a user can easily touch both sides of the display without obstructing the image display section 3. Accordingly, Wörn cannot be said to teach or suggest, among other features, providing a display apparatus with switch groups arranged on left and right sides such that a user on one side cannot touch switches arranged on the opposite side without obstructing the image display section.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

The secondary citations to Shimabukuro and Morgenthaler were discussed in Applicants' previous Amendment. The secondary citation to Choi is relied upon for teaching switches arranged in symmetrical positions. The secondary citation to Knox relates to a display apparatus and is relied upon for its rear projection display. All of the secondary citations, however, fail to compensate for the deficiencies in Wörn as discussed above with respect to Applicants' independent Claim 8. Therefore, without conceding the propriety of combining the

art in the manner proposed in the Office Action, such combinations still fail to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claim 8 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 5-7 and 9 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
SDM/vnm

FCHS_WS 1550567v1